

REMARKS

This responds to the office action mailed December 14, 2005. In the office action the Examiner states that the application is directed to two species, one to the species illustrated in Figure 2 ("Species 1") and one to the species illustrated in Figure 3 ("Species 2"). Examiner alleges the patentable distinction between the two is that Species 1 is in parallel and that Species 2 is in series. In response to the restriction requirement mailed January 5, 2006, applicant elects with traverse the specie of Figures 3, Species 2, for prosecution on the merits. At least claims 37-50 and 52-75 are believed to be readable on Figure 3.

Applicant traverses this election requirement because independent claims 37, 54, 55 and 75 and many of the dependent claims as well are generic to both species.

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are claims 37-50 and 52-75. Claim 51 is provisionally withdrawn from consideration without prejudice to consideration upon allowance of a generic claim upon which claim 51 depends.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to enter this election and commence prosecution on the merits. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (212) 309-6719, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/14/06

  
James S. McDonald 44,229  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
(Reg. No.)  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178  
(212) 309-6719